United Nations A/C.3/64/SR.46

General Assembly
Sixty-fourth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
11 March 2010
English
Original: French

Third Committee

Summary record of the 46th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 23 November 2009, at 10 a.m.

Chairperson: Mr. Penke ..... (Latvia)

Contents

Agenda item 41: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

Agenda item 64: Report of the Human Rights Council (*continued*)

Agenda item 67: Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)

(b) Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action (*continued*)

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

09-61655 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

Agenda item 41: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)
(A/C.3/64/L.59/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/64/L.59/Rev.1: Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa

1. **The Chairperson** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

2. **Ms. Sulimani** (Sierra Leone), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States and other sponsors of the draft resolution, said that the current text resembled the one from the previous year and expressed the hope that it, too, would be adopted by consensus. The main changes, which concerned the fourth and sixth preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 2, 3, 7 and 14, had been adopted by consensus by the delegations concerned after two rounds of negotiations. She was particularly pleased with the inclusion of a paragraph welcoming the recently adopted African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa.

3. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, the Czech Republic, France, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Lithuania, Mexico, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

4. *Draft resolution A/C.3/64/L.59/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.*

5. **The Chairperson** said that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 41.

Agenda item 64: Report of the Human Rights Council (*continued*) (A/C.3/64/L.61 and L.63)

Draft resolution A/C.3/64/L.61: Report of the Human Rights Council

6. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that draft resolution A/C.3/64/L.61, which was actually a draft decision, had been reissued for technical reasons.

7. **The Chairperson** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

8. **Ms. Kondolo** (Zambia), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, said that the establishment of the Human Rights Council had been an important step for the protection of human rights. She noted that the draft resolution was identical to the one adopted by the General Assembly the previous year, and expressed the hope that it would be adopted by consensus.

9. **The Chairperson** said that the Russian Federation had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

10. *Draft resolution A/C.3/64/L.61 was adopted without a vote.*

11. **Mr. Attiya** (Egypt) said that his delegation aligned itself with the statement made by the representative of Zambia. He pointed out, however, that the report of the Council on the work of its twelfth session had not yet been issued and thus could not be considered. The report addressed issues that were important for the Egyptian delegation, such as the work of the Working Group on the Right to Development and the relevant resolutions adopted by the Human Rights Council on the right to development. It also contained a resolution on freedom of opinion and expression, a joint initiative of the United States of America and Egypt. He hoped that the difficulties which had prevented the consideration of those issues would be resolved in the future so that the Committee would not have to adopt ad hoc solutions and consider the report of the Council a year late.

12. **Mr. Pak** Tok Hun (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his delegation rejected the section of the Human Rights Council's report pertaining to the situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, due to its lack of objectivity.

13. **Ms. Shahar Ben-Ami** (Israel) said that her delegation was becoming increasingly concerned about the methods used by the Human Rights Council, but had decided to join the consensus in the hope that the Council would be able to change its modus operandi. Her country denounced the application of double standards and reserved judgement on the Council's recommendations.

14. **Ms. Schlyter** (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the report of the Human Rights Council, which was of interest to all Member

States, should have been considered by the General Assembly.

Draft resolution A/C.3/64/L.63: Office of the President of the Human Rights Council

15. **The Chairperson** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

16. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Argentina, Jordan, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Nigeria, Romania and Somalia had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

17. **Ms. Kohli** (Switzerland) said that the draft resolution was a compromise text because it retained the recommendation to establish an Office of the President of the Human Rights Council, while leaving time to define its modalities. She regretted that the initiative had not received broader support but reaffirmed that the issue should be addressed in the context of the review of the Human Rights Council's work and functioning. She trusted that the text would be adopted by consensus.

18. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Algeria, Azerbaijan, Benin, Brazil, Cape Verde, Chile, Turkey and Uruguay had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

19. *Draft resolution A/C.3/64/L.63 was adopted without a vote.*

20. **The Chairperson** said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 64.

Agenda item 67: Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)

(b) Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action (*continued*) (A/C.3/64/L.55)

Draft decision A/C.3/64/L.55: Adoption of the outcome document of the Durban Review Conference

21. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Russian Federation had joined the sponsors. He read out the changes made to the text by the main sponsor, the Sudan, during the introduction of the draft: in paragraph (b), the words "the provisions of" should be deleted.

22. **The Chairperson** said that the draft decision had no programme budget implications.

23. **Ms. Abdelrahman** (Sudan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, proposed that paragraph (a) should be deleted and that paragraphs (b) and (c) should become paragraphs 1 and 2, respectively.

24. **Ms. Shahar Ben-Ami** (Israel) said that the 2001 World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance had been the worst manifestation of anti-Semitism in modern history. Israel had hoped that the Durban Review Conference would rectify the errors made at the 2001 Conference, but that had not been the case. Israel was firmly committed to combating racism, but refused to support a process which demonstrated an obsession with the Middle East. The Israeli delegation requested a vote on the draft decision and would vote against it.

25. *The meeting was suspended at 10.55 a.m. and resumed at 11 a.m.*

26. *A recorded vote was taken on draft decision A/C.3/64/L.55, as orally revised.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique,

Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Australia, Canada, Israel, Netherlands, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Czech Republic, Georgia, Germany, Italy, New Zealand, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Tonga.

27. *Draft decision A/C.3/64/L.55, as orally revised, was adopted by 163 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.*

28. **Mr. Preston** (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft decision, but wished nonetheless to recall the interpretative statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom at the Durban Review Conference concerning freedom of expression, resourcing implementation of the provisions of the Conference outcome document and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

29. **Ms. Boutin** (Canada) said that while Canada was deeply involved in national and international efforts to combat racism and supported most of the strategies laid out in the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action adopted in 2001, it continued to reject the politicization of certain parts of those documents, especially those which referred directly or indirectly to the Middle East. As the outcome document of the Durban Review Conference was worded in such a way as to reaffirm the provisions of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action in their entirety, Canada, which had refused on principle to participate in that Conference, had been compelled to vote against the draft decision.

30. **Ms. Samson** (Netherlands) said that the Netherlands, which had not taken part in the Durban Review Conference, had deemed it necessary to vote against the draft decision because, despite the considerable efforts made by a number of participants, the outcome document did not meet its expectations. Moreover, aware that many people worldwide continued to suffer from discrimination, the Netherlands had undertaken to step up its efforts to combat racism and other forms of intolerance and discrimination at the national and international levels and to take concrete measures to follow up on the Durban Conference of 2001. The Government of the Netherlands had therefore developed a national action plan against racism and had set up anti-discrimination boards nationwide. Moreover, it would hold consultations with the Anti-Discrimination Unit of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, whose work it commended, with a view to exploring concrete cooperation with the Unit in combating racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance.

31. **Ms. Richardson** (New Zealand) said that New Zealand, as a multiracial country, attached the greatest importance to efforts to combat racism and related intolerance. However, it had declined to participate in the Durban Review Conference, fearing that the event would be characterized by unproductive debate. Indeed, abhorrent anti-Israel opinions had been expressed there and had hampered efforts to concentrate on genuine anti-racism initiatives, and they were especially regrettable given that they had been made at the commencement of a gathering whose purpose had been precisely to combat intolerance. The delegation of New Zealand had therefore abstained from voting on the draft decision, but nonetheless did not oppose the spirit of the Review Conference outcome document, and would consider each future draft resolution based on its respective merits in the area of combating racism and intolerance.

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights *(continued)*

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms *(continued)* (A/C.3/64/L.26/Rev.1, L.39/Rev.1, L.43 and L.43/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/64/L.26/Rev.1: Strengthening the role of the United Nations in enhancing periodic and genuine elections and the promotion of democratization

32. **The Chairperson** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

33. **Ms. Phipps** (United States of America) introduced draft resolution A/C.3/64/L.26/Rev.1 on behalf of the sponsors, which had been joined by the Netherlands, Slovenia and Sweden. For the first time in many years, the traditional sponsors of the draft resolution had held consultations open to all Member States. As a result of that process, many changes had been made to the draft, including the addition of five preambular paragraphs and an operative paragraph. Three of the new preambular paragraphs reflected the content of the paragraph on democracy in the 2005 World Summit Outcome, and the other two reinforced the idea that countries themselves were responsible for their electoral processes and that electoral assistance was provided only at the specific request of the Member State concerned. The new operative paragraph reaffirmed that the assistance provided by the United Nations was objective, impartial, neutral and independent. In addition, several other changes had been made to the draft at the suggestion of the delegations which had participated in the consultations; they concerned, in particular, references to sustainable and cost-effective technologies, coordination challenges posed by the multiplicity of actors involved in electoral assistance and States' evolving electoral needs and legislation. In that respect, the sponsors of the draft resolution acknowledged the aim of harmonizing the many methods of providing electoral assistance used by different organizations and expressed appreciation for the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the related Code of Conduct drawn up by the secretariat of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, which were already being followed by several regional organizations in their observation missions. However, the sponsors had not wished to recommend their implementation at the current stage, as the principles had not been considered at the intergovernmental level, and thus had decided to mention them as optional guidelines only. The sponsors had also made three other changes to the revised text, in the hope that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus: starting in the fourth line of the ninth preambular paragraph, the phrase "such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status" should be deleted; in the third line of the thirteenth preambular paragraph, the words "in particular" should be deleted; and in the third line of the fifteenth preambular paragraph, the words "in requesting countries" had been inserted after the words "election processes".

34. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Austria, Belgium, Cape Verde, Comoros, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Namibia, Nigeria, Poland, Portugal, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Ukraine and Uruguay had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

35. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation), recognizing that the holding of free, periodic elections was a fundamental condition for democracy, congratulated the sponsors of the draft upon their initiative and thanked them for taking into account the observations made by various delegations. However, contrary to what paragraph 8 of the draft resolution implied, the Declaration of Principles and the Code of Conduct had not been developed as part of an intergovernmental process, but by representatives of civil society. While his delegation supported the rest of the draft, it was opposed in principle to the idea of legitimizing, by a General Assembly resolution, a document developed by a non-governmental organization when that document had not been discussed at the intergovernmental level. His delegation therefore requested that the second part of paragraph 8, which began "and in this regard expresses appreciation", should be put to a vote in accordance with rule 129 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure. His delegation would vote against it.

36. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that, at the request of the Russian delegation, a recorded vote would be taken on the second part of

paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, which read, "and in this regard expresses appreciation for the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the Code of Conduct for International Election Observers, which elaborate guidelines for international electoral observation".

37. **Mr. Attiya** (Egypt), speaking on a point of order, asked for clarification of the purpose of the vote, as he was unsure whether a vote in favour would be considered to support the Russian Federation's proposal, the current wording of paragraph 8 of the draft resolution or the adoption of the text in its entirety.

38. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that by invoking rule 129 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure, the Russian delegation had requested a vote on one part of the draft resolution. In the current case, it was a vote for or against the current wording of paragraph 8.

39. **Ms. Phipps** (United States of America) said that her delegation, as the main sponsor, evidently supported the draft resolution as a whole and would therefore vote in favour of retaining the second part of paragraph 8. She hoped that the 78 other sponsors of the draft resolution would do the same.

40. *A recorded vote was taken on the second part of paragraph 8 of the draft resolution.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Against:

Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malaysia, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Singapore, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Cameroon, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Mozambique, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan.

41. *The second part of paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.3/64/L.26/Rev.1 was adopted by 121 votes to 19, with 28 abstentions.*

42. **Mr. Attiya** (Egypt) said it was his understanding that by taking a vote under rule 129 of the rules of procedure, the Committee had adopted the draft resolution as a whole.

43. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) recalled that voting in favour of one part of a draft resolution was not the same as adopting the entire resolution, but only the text in question.

44. **Ms. Phipps** (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, asked the Chairperson and the Secretary to confirm that when a vote taken under rule 129 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure resulted in the retention of the part of the draft voted upon, the text as a whole could be adopted without a vote.

45. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) confirmed that that was the case, unless, of course, a delegation specifically requested a vote.

46. **Mr. Attiya** (Egypt) said that since the vote which had just taken place did not concern the adoption of an amendment, but the retention of a part of the text submitted, rule 129 of the rules of procedure required that the draft resolution should be put to a vote.

47. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) explained that rule 129 of the rules of procedure provided that when a representative put forward a motion for division, meaning a request for a separate vote on part of a draft resolution, any delegation could object to that request. The motion for division would then be voted upon, and if carried, the rest of the draft would be put to the vote as a whole. In the current case, however, that provision did not apply, since there had been no objections to the motion for division. Unless a vote was specifically requested, the draft resolution could be adopted by consensus.

48. **Mr. Attiya** (Egypt) said that he did not understand how a rule could be implemented only partially. He believed that in the current case, the second part of rule 129 of the rules of procedure should apply, since the Committee had just voted on a motion for division. He asked the Secretary to read out the rule in question for clarification.

49. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) read out rule 129 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure.

50. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation) said that he wished to clarify that his delegation had tried to formulate its comments on the second part of paragraph 8 of the draft resolution in such a way as to avoid taking a vote on the draft resolution as a whole, since his delegation was in favour of the text.

51. **Ms. Phipps** (United States of America) requested that, in light of the clarifications made by the Russian delegation, and if no one requested a vote, the draft resolution should be adopted without delay.

52. **Mr. Attiya** (Egypt) confirmed that the Egyptian delegation supported the draft resolution.

53. *Draft resolution A/C.3/64/L.26/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.*

54. **Ms. Pérez Álvarez** (Cuba) said that her country did not associate itself with the consensus in relation to paragraph 8 because the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the related Code of Conduct for International Election Observers mentioned in that paragraph had not been adopted following an intergovernmental discussion process. She added that international observation was not always necessary for ensuring that elections were free and fair and that it should be provided only at the request and with the consent of the States concerned. She also emphasized that the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, such as respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference in the internal affairs of States and the right to self-determination, must be respected. Finally, she recalled that there was no single model of democracy in the world.

55. **Mr. Emadi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his country had joined the consensus. He recalled the second and fourth preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution and said that the electoral assistance provided by the United Nations should not call into question the ability of local electoral institutions to organize fair elections. He reserved his country's position on paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, which mentioned the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation.

56. **Mr. Attiya** (Egypt) said that his country, which opposed paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, had nonetheless joined the consensus on the text as a whole. He explained that Egypt was bound only by what the Heads of State and Government of the African Union had adopted, and not by what the secretariat of that organization had approved. He explained that, on principle, his country opposed texts which had not been subject to intergovernmental negotiations, as was the case of the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation.

57. **Mr. El-Shakshuki** (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his country had joined the general consensus on the draft resolution. He reaffirmed that elections were not the only way to ensure democracy and that other mechanisms existed, such as direct choice of leaders, which was practised in his country.

58. **Ms. Méndez Romero** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that she welcomed the thrust of the first and second preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution. She remarked that indirect or representative democracy was not the only model of democracy in the world and that other forms, such as participatory democracy, also existed. In Venezuela, for example, participatory democracy took the form of elections, popular consultations and constitutional referendums. She added that the organization of public elections was not enough to guarantee stable and genuinely democratic regimes. Poverty, marginalization, illiteracy

and low levels of human development were all obstacles to democracy. That meant that without social justice, there could be no true, genuine and stable democracy. The United Nations must take into account citizen participation, equality and social justice in any action it undertook in the area of democracy promotion. With respect to the electoral assistance provided by the United Nations, she pointed out that such assistance should be provided only at the request and with the consent of the States concerned, which had exclusive responsibility for organizing the elections. That meant that the principles of national sovereignty and non-interference, as well as national legislation, must be respected by all. It was up to national electoral authorities to coordinate the activities carried out by the multitude of actors that provided electoral assistance. While national or international election observation missions often served to reinforce confidence and calm, they were not always necessary. It was important that any electoral assistance requested by States should be provided with utmost respect for the principles of objectivity, impartiality, neutrality and independence. Finally, she expressed reservations about the tenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, which stressed the importance of media freedom. She claimed that the exercise of that freedom, which carried duties and responsibilities, must be regulated by the State and could be subject to restrictions under article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

Draft resolution A/C.3/64/L.39/Rev.1: Elimination of all forms of intolerance and of discrimination based on religion or belief

59. **The Chairperson** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

60. **Ms. Martensson** (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the European Union and the other main sponsors, said that since the introduction of the draft resolution, Israel, Turkey, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America and Uruguay had also become sponsors. She welcomed the constructive atmosphere in which the draft resolution had been drawn up. She read out a final oral revision, which consisted of inserting the fifth preambular paragraph of the previous year's resolution (63/181) between the third and fourth preambular paragraphs of the current text: "Considering that religion or belief, for those who profess either, is one of the fundamental elements in their conception of life and that freedom of religion or belief should be fully respected and guaranteed".

61. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Brazil, Congo, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Republic of Korea, Seychelles, Thailand and Ukraine had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

62. **Mr. Rastam** (Malaysia), speaking on behalf of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), reaffirmed that OIC opposed all forms of intolerance and discrimination based on religion or belief, condemned all acts of violence committed in the name of religion and believed that all of the world's religions shared the same values of peace, respect for others, and the sanctity of human life. Without opposing the general thrust of the draft resolution, OIC regretted that not all of its concerns had been addressed, and hoped that the differences could be resolved in the future. He felt that not enough emphasis had been placed on the role of education, prevention, and interreligious and intercultural dialogues in the elimination of intolerance and discrimination based on religion or belief. He noted that the freedom of opinion and expression, important as it was, must nonetheless be exercised responsibly, with respect for the freedom of religion and belief. He added that in joining the consensus on the draft resolution, OIC reserved the right to comment on any future texts.

63. *Draft resolution A/C.3/64/L.39/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/64/L.43/Rev.1: Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism

64. **The Chairperson** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

65. **Mr. de León Huerta** (Mexico) requested that the adoption of the draft resolution should be deferred to the following day, so that it might be possible to complete the informal consultations.

Draft resolution A/C.3/64/L.49: Human rights and cultural diversity

66. **Ms. Pérez Álvarez** (Cuba) said that informal consultations were still being held on the draft resolution and requested that its adoption should be deferred to the following day.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.